

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

KELLOGG, HUBER, HANSEN, TODD & EVANS, P.L.L.C.

1301 K STREET, N.W.  
SUITE 1000 WEST  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3317

MICHAEL K. KELLOGG  
PETER W. HUBER  
MARK C. HANSEN  
K. CHRIS TODD  
MARK L. EVANS  
AUSTIN C. SCHLICK  
STEVEN F. BENZ

(202) 326-7900

FACSIMILE:  
(202) 326-7999

NEIL M. GORSUCH  
GEOFFREY M. KLINEBERG  
REID M. FIGEL  
HENK BRANDS  
SEAN A. LEONARD  
COURTNEY SIMMONS ELWOOD  
EVAN T. LEO

March 1, 2000

FILED  
MAR 1 2000  
FCC

**Ex Parte Submission**

Magalie Roman Salas, Esq.  
Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554


Re: *Application of SBC Communications Inc. Pursuant to Section 271 of the  
Telecommunications Act of 1996 to Provide In-Region, InterLATA  
Services in Texas, CC Docket No. 00-4*

Dear Ms. Salas:

Enclosed for filing please find an original and one copy of errata to the Reply Brief in Support of Application by Southwestern Bell for Provision of In-Region, InterLATA Services in Texas, originally filed on February 22, 2000. The errata do not involve substantive changes, but simply make typographical and clerical corrections. Also enclosed are two copies of a corrected version of the Reply Brief, which incorporate the listed corrections.

Please let me know if you have any questions about this matter.

Sincerely,

  
Austin C. Schlick

cc: Ms. Stephens  
Ms. Wright  
Ms. Farroba, Texas PUC  
Ms. Heisler, DOJ  
ITS

No. of Copies rec'd  
11

012

## ERRATA TO SOUTHWESTERN BELL REPLY BRIEF

Page 1, line 6, delete space after “1,900”.

Page 2, line 14, delete "operations systems support (“OSS”)" and insert in lieu thereof: “OSS”.

Page 4, last full sentence of paragraph, after “use” insert “for unbundled loops”; on same page in footnote 3, delete “SWBT’s” and insert in lieu thereof: “Southwestern Bell’s”.

Page 12, third line, delete “resold” and insert in lieu thereof: “facilities-based”; in footnote 8, on same page, after “Table 2.9” insert “; Southwestern Bell Br. Attach. 2 at 5.”

Page 15, second full paragraph, line 9, move “CLECs” to before “, however”.

Page 16, last paragraph, line 6, insert “1999” after “December”.

Page 18, second full paragraph, line 8, after “February,” insert “where it requires unbundled loops,”; in the same paragraph, line 10, delete “App. A. Part” and insert in lieu thereof: “App. A, Part”; in the last line of the same paragraph, delete “¶¶ 4,8” and insert in lieu thereof: “¶¶ 4, 8”.

Page 20, first line, delete space before footnote indication number “9”; on same page, first full paragraph, line six, delete “performance – measurement” and insert in lieu thereof: “performance measurement”; in same sentence, delete “their”.

Page 21, line 2, beginning of sentence, delete “A” and insert in lieu thereof: “In addition, a”.

Page 23, first full paragraph, line 7, delete “between September and December” and insert in lieu thereof: “from September to December”.

Page 24, line 9, delete “missed-due” and insert in lieu thereof: “missed due”.

Page 25, line 1, delete “id.” and insert in lieu thereof: “Id.”

Page 27, footnote 14, line 9, delete “Because this interconnection agreement” and insert in lieu thereof: “These terms, and/or terms from the companion Rhythms agreement,”; in same sentence delete “will be a part” and replace with “will be made a part”; in same sentence, insert “In the interim,” before “any CLEC may opt”. Delete “it effective immediately” and insert in lieu thereof: “the Covad agreement or the Rhythms agreement”.

Page 28, first full paragraph, delete “Chapman Reply Aff. ¶ 58” and insert in lieu thereof: “Ham Aff. ¶¶ 10, 60.”

Page 29, line 2, delete “order DSL” and insert in lieu thereof: “order (non-line shared) DSL”.

Page 33, second full paragraph, line 5, delete “After” and insert in lieu thereof: “Even after”.

Page 37, line 13, delete “all unbundled” and insert in lieu thereof: “all (non-line shared) unbundled”.

Page 37, footnote 19, line 3, delete “ILEC SBC” and insert in lieu thereof: “SBC ILEC”.

Page 39, footnote 20, line 2, delete “a minimum of”; in same sentence, delete, “requires SWBT to complete each loop in a minimum time of 5 minutes.” and insert in lieu thereof: “is equivalent to 5 minutes per loop.”

Page 41, line 3, delete “actually exceeds Bell Atlantic’s” and insert in lieu thereof: “for out-of-service conditions actually betters the New York Order’s 2 percent mark, with”.

Page 41, line 7, delete “reconciled data” and insert in lieu thereof: “reconciled CHC data”

Page 41, footnote 22, line 1, delete “high” and insert in lieu thereof: “higher”

Page 42, line 11, delete “id.,” and insert in lieu thereof: “id. ¶ 10,”.

Page 45, footnote 23, move footnote indication number to end of preceeding second bulleted paragraph.

Page 45, footnote 23, line 1, delete “also”; in same paragraph, last line, delete “DOJ” and insert in lieu thereof: “DOJ at 22-23”.

Page 47, first full paragraph, line 1, delete “Warner complain” and insert in lieu thereof: “Warner, complain”.

Page 47, footnote 24, line 6, delete “Dysart Reply Aff. ¶ n.21” and insert in lieu thereof: “Dysart Reply Aff. ¶ 59”

Page 49, line 1, delete “Id” and insert in lieu thereof: “Deere Reply Aff”.

Page 54, line 7, move end of paragraph, beginning with “As the Commission noted,” and ending with “that are rejected for an address mismatch).”, to end of next paragraph, after “Conway Reply Aff. ¶ 16.”.

Page 55, last paragraph, capitalize first letter of “evaluation” to read “Evaluation”.

Page 59, fourth bulleted paragraph, move the word “EDI” after “CLEC’s”.

Page 64, footnote 29, delete “successfully” and insert in lieu thereof: “successful”; insert the word “of” after “testing”.

Page 65, second paragraph, delete “Dysart Aff. ¶ 4” and insert in lieu thereof: “Dysart Aff. ¶¶ 21-24; Dysart Reply Aff. ¶¶ 9-10.”

Page 68, second paragraph, indent prior to DOJ.

Page 68, paragraph numbered 5, add initial caps to “collaborative process” to read “Collaborative Process”.

Page 70, delete footnote number 33 and insert new footnote thereof: “See, e.g., Brosler Reply Aff. ¶¶ 13-16 (availability of interconnection facilities); id. ¶¶ 4-5 (access to raw performance data); Conway Reply Aff. ¶¶ 17-22 (LSR tracking); id. ¶ 38 (LOC staffing); Auinbauh Reply Aff. ¶ 51 (CLEC training); Young Reply Aff. ¶¶ 4-6 (DS1 reconfiguration); Auinbauh Reply Aff. ¶¶ 18 (shared transport); id. ¶¶ 38-39 (EEL); Young Reply Aff. ¶¶ 7-10 (EEL); Deere Reply Aff. ¶¶ 26-27 (unbundled switching); id. ¶¶ 28-32 (E911); id. ¶ 33 (call-related databases); Rogers Reply Aff. ¶¶ 13-24 (call-related databases); id. ¶¶ 5-12 (directory listings); Fleming Reply Aff. (number portability); Deere Reply Aff. ¶¶ 34-35 (number portability/NXX code openings); Auinbauh Reply Aff. ¶¶ 45-48 (reciprocal compensation); id. ¶¶ 19-20, 49-50 (resale); Rogers Reply Aff. ¶ 4 (resale); see also Response to DOJ (response to DOJ).”

Page 71, heading A, remove period at end of heading.

Page 71, second paragraph, third sentence, move comma after “equivalent,” to after “to,”; sentence should read “agreement is equivalent to, or fuller than”.

Page 71, footnote 34, remove extra space before “supinfo\_”.

Page 74, heading B, remove period at end of heading.

Page 75, heading A, delete “In” and insert in lieu thereof: “in”; remove period at end of heading.

Page 77, paragraph numbered 3, in quote delete “as” and insert in lieu thereof: “an”.

Page 77, second paragraph, underline “Petition of Accelerated Connections Inc.”.

Page 79, second paragraph, delete “Blue Star” and insert in lieu thereof: “BlueStar”.

Page 81, paragraph numbered 1, last sentence, insert “Tex. PUC” prior to “Dec. 16, 1999” and insert “Open Meeting” after “Dec. 16, 1999”.

Page 84, fourth paragraph, third sentence, delete “and” after “finalized”; insert a comma after “measurements”; delete “that,”.

Page 85, first full paragraph, middle of paragraph delete “¶” symbol before the word “Attach”.

Page 85, delete “sub-measurement” and insert in lieu thereof: “submeasurement”.

Page 86, first paragraph, third sentence insert the word “reported” after “47”; delete Roman Numeral “II” and insert in lieu thereof: “2”; delete Roman Numeral “I” and insert in lieu thereof: “1”.

Page 86, first paragraph, fourth sentence delete Roman Numeral “I” and insert in lieu thereof: “1”.

Page 86, second paragraph, third sentence, after “performance for” insert “key measurements relating to nascent services for”; in next sentence, delete “Texas 271 Agreement Response to DOJ7, at 20” and insert in lieu thereof: “Dysart Aff. Attach. H § 14.3”.

Page 87, first paragraph delete “a” before the word “sample”.

Page 87, second paragraph, last sentence, delete “that” and insert in lieu thereof: “than” prior to “\$1 million”.

Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED  
MAR 1 2000  
FCC

In the Matter of

Application by SBC Communications Inc.,  
Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, and  
Southwestern Bell Communications Services,  
Inc. d/b/a Southwestern Bell Long Distance  
for Provision of In-Region, InterLATA  
Services in Texas

CC Docket No. 00-4

To: The Commission

**REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF APPLICATION BY SOUTHWESTERN BELL  
FOR PROVISION OF IN-REGION, INTERLATA SERVICES IN TEXAS**

JAMES D. ELLIS  
PAUL M. MANCINI  
MARTIN E. GRAMBOW  
KELLY M. MURRAY  
175 E. Houston  
San Antonio, Texas 78205  
(210) 351-3410  
*Counsel for SBC Communications Inc.*

ALFRED G. RICHTER, JR.  
175 E. Houston  
Room #1250  
San Antonio, Texas 78205  
(210) 351-3500

ANN E. MEULEMAN  
1616 Guadalupe Street, Room 600  
Austin, Texas 78701-1298  
(512) 870-5709  
*Counsel for Southwestern Bell  
Telephone Company*

MICHAEL K. KELLOGG  
AUSTIN C. SCHLICK  
DAVID L. SCHWARZ  
KELLOGG, HUBER, HANSEN,  
TODD & EVANS, P.L.L.C.  
1301 K Street, N.W.  
Suite 1000 West  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 326-7900  
*Counsel for SBC Communications Inc.,  
Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, and  
Southwestern Bell Communications  
Services, Inc.*

February 22, 2000

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	1
DISCUSSION.....	9
I. LOCAL COMPETITION IN TEXAS IS UBIQUITOUS, EXTENSIVE, AND IRREVERSIBLE.....	9
II. SOUTHWESTERN BELL PROVIDES ACCESS TO xDSL- CAPABLE LOOPS AND HOT CUTS.....	12
A. Southwestern Bell Satisfies Both of the Commission's Alternative Tests for Demonstrating Nondiscriminatory Access to xDSL-Capable Loops .....	13
1. DOJ's Attack on SWBT's Performance Data Does Not Undermine Southwestern Bell's Proof .....	19
2. Additional CLEC Allegations of Discrimination Are Likewise Unfounded.....	26
3. Southwestern Bell Has Additionally Satisfied the Checklist Requirements for xDSL-Capable Loops by Establishing an Operational Separate Advanced Services Affiliate .....	34
B. SWBT Satisfies the Hot-Cut Performance Standards of this Commission and the Texas PUC .....	38
III. SOUTHWESTERN BELL SATISFIES OTHER CHECKLIST REQUIREMENTS.....	42
A. Interconnection .....	43
B. UNE Platform Order Processing.....	52
C. Pricing of Network Elements.....	55
D. Nondiscriminatory Access to OSS.....	58
1. Telcordia's Test of SWBT's OSS.....	60
2. Change Management Process .....	63
3. Pre-Ordering: Parsed Address Information .....	66
4. Ordering: Flow Through and Rejections .....	66

5.	Double Billing.....	68
E.	Miscellaneous Checklist Issues.....	69
IV.	SOUTHWESTERN BELL HAS SHOWN THAT IT WILL COMPLY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 272.....	70
A.	Southwestern Bell Provides Full Public Disclosure of the Terms and Conditions of All Transactions Between SWBT and SBCS.....	71
B.	AT&T's Arguments Concerning SWBT's Proposed Intrastate Switched Access Tariffs Are Moot.....	74
V.	APPROVAL OF THE APPLICATION WOULD BE CONSISTENT WITH THE PUBLIC INTEREST.....	74
A.	SWBT Has Not Engaged In Misconduct.....	75
B.	The Performance Remedy Plan Approved by the Texas Commission Will Prevent Any "Backsliding" by SWBT.....	81
	CONCLUSION.....	88
	ATTACHMENT 1 (Southwestern Bell's Response to the Department of Justice Evaluation)	



**Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of

Application by SBC Communications Inc.,  
Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, and  
Southwestern Bell Communications Services,  
Inc. d/b/a Southwestern Bell Long Distance  
for Provision of In-Region, InterLATA  
Services in Texas

CC Docket No. 00-4

MAK 1 2000

FCC MAR 7 2000

To: The Commission

**REPLY BRIEF OF SOUTHWESTERN BELL  
IN SUPPORT OF INTERLATA RELIEF IN TEXAS**

The record in this proceeding is enormous. It includes more than 110,000 pages of materials generated in extensive hearings before the Public Utility Commission of Texas. These materials describe in detail Southwestern Bell's compliance with the 14-point checklist and other requirements of section 271; they track Southwestern Bell's interconnection agreements with 237 different CLECs in Texas; and they monitor Southwestern Bell's performance with respect to approximately 1,900 measures and submeasures, applied on a monthly basis to each of those CLECs. The record also includes detailed information concerning the state of competition in every local telecommunications market in Texas.

The sheer bulk of this material could easily be overwhelming. But this proceeding does not involve a matter of first impression. Southwestern Bell's Application comes to this Commission only after comprehensive screening, sifting, and analysis by the Texas PUC. The Texas Commission has played precisely the role anticipated by the FCC when it urged state commissions "to develop a comprehensive factual record concerning the applicant's compliance

with the requirements of section 271 and the status of local competition.”<sup>1</sup> In the Bell Atlantic New York proceeding, the Commission set out specific criteria for judging state commission evaluations of section 271 applications, and afforded substantial weight to the New York Public Service Commission’s findings under those guidelines. To warrant deference, the Commission stated, a state commission’s review should include: “(1) full and open participation by all interested parties; (2) extensive independent third party testing of [the BOC’s] operations support systems (OSS) offering; (3) development of clearly defined performance measures and standards; and (4) adoption of performance assurance measures that create a strong financial incentive for post-entry compliance with the section 271 checklist.”<sup>2</sup>

The Texas Commission has satisfied – indeed, exceeded – all of these standards. In its Mega-Arbitration during 1996 and 1997, and then in section 271 proceedings that lasted the next two years, the Texas PUC addressed every issue relating to local competition in Texas that any CLEC saw fit to present. See Southwestern Bell Br. at 3-6. Together with related dockets, the Texas record includes independent testing of Southwestern Bell’s OSS, see id. at 27-31; development of comprehensive performance measures, some of which this Commission subsequently relied upon in its SBC/Ameritech merger conditions, see id. at 12-22; a performance remedy package that, Southwestern Bell believes, is more thorough and rigorous

---

<sup>1</sup> Memorandum Opinion and Order, Application of BellSouth Corporation, et al. Pursuant to Section 271 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, To Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services In South Carolina, 13 FCC Rcd 539, 554, ¶ 29 (1997).

<sup>2</sup> Memorandum Opinion and Order, Application by Bell Atlantic New York for Authorization Under Section 271 of the Communications Act to Provide In-Region, InterLATA Service in the State of New York, CC Docket No. 99-295, FCC 99-404, ¶ 8 (rel. Dec. 22, 1999) (“New York Order”).

than any other such plan anywhere in the country, see id. at 20-22; and point-by-point resolution of hundreds of concerns voiced by CLECs and the Texas Commission and its staff.

None of the commenters in this proceeding has criticized the processes employed by the Texas Commission or suggested that the Texas PUC did anything but bend over backwards to ensure that local markets are fully open to CLECs. The Department of Justice (“DOJ”) has itself recognized that “the Texas PUC and its staff worked carefully and extensively to define the terms, conditions, and operational details necessary for the development of competition in the State of Texas” and to test Southwestern Bell’s compliance with those conditions. DOJ Evaluation at 3.

As a result of these efforts by the Texas PUC, there is no genuine dispute as to most of the issues before this Commission. It is clear that local competition in Texas amply satisfies the requirements of section 271(a)(1). No one seriously disputes that Southwestern Bell has complied with most of the checklist items, or makes more than a half-hearted effort to debate Southwestern Bell's satisfaction of section 272. Every month, Southwestern Bell consistently meets or exceeds the Texas PUC’s performance standards for the overwhelming majority (about 90 percent) of the 1,900 performance measures and submeasures. And no one credibly contests that Texas consumers would benefit enormously from the increased competition in long distance that Southwestern Bell’s entry would bring.

There are really only two major issues left in dispute. This in itself is remarkable. Out of literally thousands of pages of rules, state requirements, and FCC decisions – established through four years of controversy and decisionmaking – the commenters have identified only two grounds that allegedly justify denying SBC’s 271 Application. These two issues are the provisioning of xDSL-capable loops and so-called “hot cuts” – (i.e., the coordinated transfer of

loops from the incumbent LEC to a CLEC). Those are the issues that have attracted the most attention, including from DOJ.<sup>3</sup> But the allegations being made are unjustified.

DSL is an issue that did not emerge until last year. As a result, in the New York section 271 proceeding, that state's PSC had not established performance measures for DSL, and Bell Atlantic had undergone no independent testing of its processes for provisioning xDSL-capable loops at the time it was granted 271 relief. Instead, Bell Atlantic agreed, at the 11th hour, to provide its own DSL service through a separate affiliate modeled after the affiliate that SBC had already established. The FCC applauded Bell Atlantic's commitment to follow SBC's lead, and said that in the future either performance data showing nondiscrimination with respect to xDSL loops, or a separate affiliate and a showing of nondiscrimination as to loops generally, would be sufficient to allay the Commission's concerns.

Southwestern Bell has met both of the FCC's two options for demonstrating nondiscriminatory access to DSL-capable loops. Although Bell Atlantic's showing for relief was itself sufficient, Southwestern Bell, unlike Bell Atlantic, has implemented, not just promised, a fully operational separate affiliate for the provision of all advanced services. The affiliate, SBC Advanced Solutions Inc. ("ASI"), began providing advanced services in Texas on February 2, and will be using the same ordering and provisioning systems and procedures as CLECs use for unbundled loops, as of February 28. ASI is operating in accordance with structural separation

---

<sup>3</sup> Commenters, including DOJ, have raised a scattershot of additional issues, but DOJ does not suggest that these other issues are themselves sufficiently serious to warrant denial of Southwestern Bell's Application. See DOJ Evaluation at 3 (recommending that the Commission "defer judgment" on issues other than provisioning of xDSL-capable loops and hot cuts). We respond to all these allegations in detail in the body of this Reply Brief and in Southwestern Bell's Response to the Department of Justice Evaluation ("Response to DOJ"), which addresses DOJ's Evaluation point-by-point.

rules that were approved by this Commission in both the SBC/Ameritech Merger Order<sup>4</sup> and the New York Order -- and has voluntarily accelerated this Commission's roll-out schedule in Texas.

Southwestern Bell has also satisfied the second option. Southwestern Bell has provided performance reports showing that Southwestern Bell's performance in providing DSL-capable loops to CLECs in Texas is at parity or the Texas PUC's benchmark level for four of the five measurement categories identified in the New York Order (i.e., quality of xDSL-capable loops, timeliness of maintenance and repair, quality of maintenance and repair, and access to OSS functions including loop information). See New York Order ¶ 335. In the fifth relevant performance category, installation intervals, there is a performance difference, but it is largely attributable to the inherent (and temporary) provisioning difference between Southwestern Bell's retail line sharing for voice and data services, as opposed to CLECs' use of stand-alone, unbundled loops. The performance difference, moreover, is not large enough to prevent an efficient CLEC from competing. To the contrary, data CLECs are growing in Texas at an incredible rate of 50 percent or more per month.

As for hot cuts, the second major issue in dispute, Southwestern Bell offers CLECs two different processes. If dissatisfied with one, the CLEC can use the other. Performance data, however, show timely and reliable hot-cut performance for both methods. In December 1999, better than 95 percent of all loop cut-overs were completed within the Texas PUC's 2-hour interval for both processes when CLEC-caused misses are excluded. Even including CLEC-caused misses, Southwestern Bell still met the 2-hour benchmark 93 to 95 percent of the time.

---

<sup>4</sup> Memorandum Opinion and Order, Application of Ameritech Corp. and SBC Communications, Inc., for Consent to Transfer Control, 14 FCC Rcd 14712 (1999) ("SBC/Ameritech Merger Order").

This on-time performance is significantly better than Bell Atlantic reported in New York.

Trouble report rates and service outages are approximately the same as in the successful New York application, and certainly allow CLECs to compete effectively.

As recently as December 1999, the Texas PUC held special proceedings to consider concerns raised with respect to xDSL-capable loops and hot cuts, and concluded that Southwestern Bell is in compliance with all requirements for section 271 relief. The Texas PUC reached its conclusions in these and other areas based on a thorough empirical investigation reflecting the entire picture of Southwestern Bell's performance and CLECs' actual opportunities for entry. DOJ, by contrast, has based its contrary recommendation on a handful of performance measures and a miscellany of CLEC anecdotes or carrier-specific snap-shots that, if susceptible to verification at all, prove to be misstated, misleading, or irrelevant.

The simple truth is that DOJ has rejected the analytic approach of this Commission's New York Order, which considered the totality of Bell Atlantic's performance and the actual competitive impact of that performance, rather than the mere existence of allegations of problems. DOJ also rejects specific holdings of the New York Order, such as this Commission's conclusion that a structurally separate advanced services affiliate would provide assurance of nondiscrimination against data CLECs. But, even while departing from this Commission's approach, DOJ has not attempted the sort of hands-on, factual investigation completed by the Texas PUC between 1996 and 1999. DOJ thus provides neither a useful assessment of Southwestern Bell's compliance with the New York Order, nor an informed second opinion on the Texas Commission's finding that local markets in Texas are "irreversibly open." Texas PUC Evaluation at 1.

Under these circumstances, it is the Texas PUC that deserves deference. As this Commission noted in its New York Order (§ 51), “[a]lthough we are statutorily required to accord substantial weight to the DOJ’s evaluation, in appropriate circumstances, we may conclude that the evidence submitted by a state commission is more persuasive than that submitted by the DOJ, particularly if the state has conducted a rigorous analysis of the evidence.” That is precisely the case here.

Like the Texas PUC, we do not claim that Southwestern Bell’s performance has been perfect. But, even where individual performance measures have fallen short for a period of time, one must put that in the context of the overwhelming majority of performance measures that Southwestern Bell has met or exceeded (thereby giving CLECs an advantage over SBC in the marketplace). More importantly, one must recognize that performance measures are not an end in themselves. They are a means to ensuring that local markets in Texas are fully open to competitors. On this critical point, the empirical evidence is unequivocal.

The Texas PUC found that CLECs serve approximately 1 million local lines in Southwestern Bell’s Texas service areas – about 9 percent of all lines. Although Southwestern Bell believes the actual number is significantly higher, it is still above the corresponding percentage Bell Atlantic itself claimed in New York. In the profitable business segment of the local market, CLECs currently serve approximately 22 percent of all business lines in Southwestern Bell’s Texas service areas, generally by using their own network facilities, and have, since April 1998, captured more than four of every five new business lines in Texas. CLECs are rapidly deploying their xDSL services as well, increasing the number of Southwestern Bell unbundled loops they use for these services by 50 percent or more each month.

Not only are these markets open today, but the Texas PUC has specifically identified the tools it intends to use to ensure that the markets remain open. These include review of Southwestern Bell's performance measures and performance results, with a "watch list" of potential emerging problems; an open docket to resolve disputes that arise between Southwestern Bell and CLECs; existing industry forums that are devoted to change management and trunking issues; an industry working group in Texas that is addressing xDSL issues; and a CLEC users' group that provides a broad-based platform for developing and pressing CLEC concerns. Texas PUC Dec. 16, 1999 Open Meeting Tr. at 60-65 (App. C-1, Tab 212). Beyond this, the Chairman of the Texas Commission has stressed that the Texas PUC would not hesitate to work with regulators in other states and with this Commission to take appropriate steps across jurisdictional lines if it became concerned about backsliding by Southwestern Bell. *Id.* at 66. Such pledges of active and forceful state commission oversight, backed by the Texas PUC's record of leadership in implementing the 1996 Act and reviewing Southwestern Bell's section 271 Application, warrant great respect from this Commission, just as they will receive great respect from Southwestern Bell.

Finally, one must not lose sight of the substantial potential benefits of Southwestern Bell's entry into the concentrated long distance market, particularly for lower-volume residential callers, whom Southwestern Bell has pledged to serve without any flat-rate monthly charges or minimum usage requirements.<sup>5</sup> These benefits have already been proven in Connecticut, where price competition has substantially lowered rates. Economists calculate that the average Texas

---

<sup>5</sup> The flip-side to increased competition in long distance markets is an increased incentive for the major long distance companies to enter local markets so as to offer one-stop shopping to



consumer will benefit by about \$38 per year if Southwestern Bell offers in Texas the interLATA rates it has proposed elsewhere. Based on conservative assumptions, immediate interLATA entry by Southwestern Bell in Texas would result in the creation of 60,000 additional jobs and an increase of \$7.6 billion in the Texas gross state product by the year 2007. Approval of this Application will benefit Texas and Texans, not just Southwestern Bell, by finally realizing the full promise of the 1996 Act. See Southwestern Bell Br. at 47-62.

The Texas Commission has confidently concluded that “SWBT has taken the statutorily required steps to open its local exchange and exchange access markets in Texas to competition,” Texas PUC Evaluation at 1, and that “SWBT’s performance measures and accompanying performance remedy plan are sufficient to hold SWBT to continued compliant performance,” id. at 111. The Texas PUC has earned the right to make that statement, just as “SWBT has earned the right to enter the long distance market” in Texas. Id. at 1.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **I. LOCAL COMPETITION IN TEXAS IS UBIQUITOUS, EXTENSIVE, AND IRREVERSIBLE**

Congress established a specific test of whether local competition in a state is sufficient to support a BOC’s section 271 application. That test is set out in the language of so-called Track A, 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(1)(A). Southwestern Bell’s satisfaction of Track A is detailed in Southwestern Bell’s Brief (at pages 9-11), and is undisputed. No party, including the CLECs cited as Track A carriers by Southwestern Bell, challenges Southwestern Bell’s satisfaction of this statutory prerequisite.

---

consumers. That is precisely what has happened in New York after Bell Atlantic’s successful section 271 application there.

The Texas PUC, moreover, confirms that

ETS, OpTel, Birch Telecom, Inc., CoServ, KMC, Sage Telecom, Inc., Allegiance Telecom of Texas, Inc., Intermedia Communications, Inc., MCI-Worldcom, Nextlink, Taylor, Time Warner Telecom, Golden Harbor, e.spire, GST, Teligent and Winstar are currently receiving access and interconnection to SWBT's network facilities pursuant to their respective interconnection agreements and satisfy Track A requirements for SWBT.

Texas PUC Evaluation at 95. Thus, the state commission agrees that Southwestern Bell meets the statutory requirement at least 17 different ways.

This unanimity establishes Southwestern Bell's statutory compliance. See New York Order ¶ 62. But satisfaction of Track A is just the beginning of the story. The Affidavit of John Habeeb details the scope and variety of CLECs' entry in Texas. By Southwestern Bell's best estimate, competitors in Texas have won approximately 12 percent of all business and residential lines in SWBT's Texas service areas. See Habeeb Aff. Table 2 & Attach. E (App. A, Part A-1, Tab 1). CLECs win the overwhelming majority of new business lines and their total share of the business market is 26 to 30 percent in Austin, Dallas/Ft. Worth, Corpus Christi, Houston, and San Antonio. Id. ¶¶ 6, 38. CLECs serve well over half of their customers' lines on a facilities basis. Id. Tables 1, 2. More than 125,000 of these facilities-based lines have been provisioned as pre-combined loop/switch port combinations, i.e., "UNE Platforms." Id. Attach. E. CLECs have won customers in 299 of SWBT's 300 local calling areas. Id. ¶¶ 6, 35.

A handful of CLECs attempt to dismiss this evidence, claiming there is only "paltry penetration by new entrants." Allegiance Comments at 12. Although some of the CLECs have hired outside experts to dress up their arguments, all rely on the same source of supposedly supporting evidence: CLEC responses to Texas PUC data requests. See AT&T's Kelley & Turner Decl. ¶¶ 13, 31; MCI WorldCom's Beard & Mayo Decl. ¶¶ 40-41; Sprint Comments at 74. Unlike the CLECs that use this data, the Texas PUC – which gathered it – is candid about its

limitations. As the Texas PUC explains, less than one-third of the CLECs submitted reports:

“SWBT’s totals represent aggregated numbers for 114 CLECs while the Texas Commission’s responses represent aggregated numbers for 31 CLECs.” Texas PUC Evaluation at 102.

Moreover, the Texas PUC data were for the months leading up to September 1999, whereas Mr. Habeeb’s Affidavit provided aggregated data through November 1999. See id.; Habeeb Aff. Attach. E.

The Texas PUC notes the inherent reliability of Southwestern Bell’s estimates of resold lines – that is, lines provided by SWBT itself. In fact, the Texas Commission has determined that Southwestern Bell’s estimate of 318,000 resold lines in October 1999 is “very accurate” and “more reliable” than CLECs’ estimates of resold lines. Texas PUC Evaluation at 102. With respect to facilities-based lines, the Texas PUC has found Southwestern Bell’s methodology for estimating lines “reasonable,” but was unable conclusively to resolve CLEC claims of lower numbers. Id. at 102-03.<sup>6</sup> Rather, the Texas Commission found that CLECs’ estimates and Southwestern Bell’s estimates establish a range for the total number of facilities-based CLEC lines in SWBT territory, which was 700,000 to 1,300,000 lines as of October 1999. Id. at 103. This undermines AT&T’s claim that “[t]here is very little facilities-based competition in Texas.” AT&T’s Kelley & Turner Decl. ¶ 12.

---

<sup>6</sup> SWBT’s methodology, and CLEC criticisms of it, are discussed in the Reply Affidavit of John Habeeb. Mr. Habeeb notes that some CLEC criticisms, such as MCI WorldCom’s claim that SWBT has based its estimates on facilities that are ordered but not yet installed (MCI WorldCom Comments at 60), are false, and others are grossly overstated. Most significant, however, is the fact that, of the 18 Texas CLECs participating in this proceeding, only two – Allegiance and ICG – dispute Southwestern Bell’s estimates of their service. See Allegiance Comments at 13 & Howland Decl.; ICG’s Rowling Aff. ¶ 51 (attached to CLEC Coalition Comments). Surely carriers such as AT&T and MCI WorldCom would have brought forth direct evidence to support their claims of inflated numbers, if they had any.

CLECs acknowledge the “credibility” and “reliable methods” of the Texas Commission in this area. Sprint Comments at 74. Taken together with the Texas PUC’s confirmation of Southwestern Bell’s resale figures, the Texas PUC’s estimate of facilities-based lines establishes a conservative, minimum CLEC line count of more than 1 million lines. See Texas PUC Evaluation at 1 (“The fact that approximately one million Texas local phone lines in SWBT’s historic service area are today served by CLECs is testimony to the fact that SWBT’s market is irreversibly open to competition.”). By way of comparison, Bell Atlantic claimed in its section 271 application that CLECs served 1.1 million lines in New York,<sup>7</sup> where Bell Atlantic serves about 20 percent more access lines than SWBT serves in Texas.<sup>8</sup> Thus, based on Bell Atlantic’s own estimates at the time of its application, CLECs have had greater competitive success in Texas than in New York. Since the Commission concluded that “barriers to competitive entry in the local market ha[d] been removed” in New York, and “the local exchange market” in New York was “open to competition,” the same must be true in Texas. New York Order ¶ 426. Regardless of their rhetoric to the contrary, CLECs have shown this by winning customers in the marketplace.

## **II. SOUTHWESTERN BELL PROVIDES NONDISCRIMINATORY ACCESS TO xDSL-CAPABLE LOOPS AND HOT CUTS**

The Texas PUC conducted three years of proceedings to ensure Southwestern Bell’s comprehensive satisfaction of the 14-point competitive checklist, in all its permutations. At the end of those arbitrations, investigations, collaborative sessions, carrier-to-carrier tests, data

---

<sup>7</sup> Bell Atlantic’s Taylor Decl. Attach. A ¶ 1, New York Application, App. A, CC Docket No. 99-295 (FCC filed Sept. 29, 1999).

<sup>8</sup> See FCC, 1998 Preliminary Statistics of Communications Common Carriers, Table 2.9; Southwestern Bell Br. Attach. 2 at 5.